

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-10 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, Claims 3 and 7 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer and the subject matter recited therein incorporated into Claims 1 and 5, respectively, by amendment herein; and Claims 9-10 added. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter is added herein.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102 and §103**

Claims 1-2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by US. Patent Number 6,646,233 to Kanno et al. (Kanno). Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanno in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,625,526 to Watanabe et al. (Watanabe). Claims 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,771,483 to Harada et al. (Harada) in view of Watanabe and Kanno. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Claims 1 and 5 each recite an electrostatic chuck having, among other features, members of a feeder terminal portion that are fixed to each other by brazing, diffusion bonding, or soldering. Claim 1 further recites a dielectric layer formed on an upper face of a substrate, wherein the feeder terminal portion and substrate are fixed to each other by mechanical joining. In the present invention, since the members of the feeder terminal portion are fixed to each other by brazing, diffusion bonding, or soldering as recited in Claims 1 and 5, when the temperature in a chamber in which the electrostatic is provided exceeds 200°C during processing of the semiconductor, the respective members of the feeder terminal portion are securely fixed to each other the dielectric breakdown due to electric discharge is prevented between the electrode and the

substrate. Therefore, the electrostatic chuck of the present invention can repeatedly be used under high temperatures during processing of the semiconductor.

Applicants respectfully note Kanno discloses a feeder terminal portion equipped with a shaft (20) and a dielectric member (47), as shown in Figure 7. However, Kanno does not disclose fixing the shaft (20) of the feeder terminal portion and the dielectric member (47) of the feeder terminal portion to each other.

Applicants respectfully submit that Harada does not disclose a feeder terminal portion.

Regarding Watanabe, Applicants note Watanabe discloses fixing a dielectric portion (186) of a feeder terminal portion and a recess (182) of a substrate (6) to each other by brazing, as discussed in column 9, lines 62-67, column 10, lines 1-4, and shown in Figure 6. However, Watanabe does not disclose fixing a pin (180) of the feeder terminal portion and the dielectric portion (186) of the feeder terminal portion to each other.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that Kanno, Harada and Watanabe, alone or in any combination thereof, fail to disclose or suggest each and every feature recited by Claims 1 and 5.

To qualify as prior art, a single reference must teach, i.e., identically disclose, each and every feature recited by a rejected claim.

Furthermore, to establish *prima facie* obviousness, each feature of a rejected claim must be taught or suggested by the applied art of record. See M.P.E.P. §2143.03.

As explained above, Kanno, Harada and/or Watanabe, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest each feature recited by Claims 1 and 5. Therefore, Kanno, Harada and/or Watanabe do not anticipate, nor render obvious, the invention recited by Claims 1 and 5.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit Claims 1 and 5 should be deemed allowable over Kanno, Harada and Watanabe.

Claims 2, 4 and 9 depend from Claim 1. Claims 6, 8 and 10 depend from Claim 5. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims be deemed allowable for at least the same reasons Claims 1 and 5 are allowable, as well as for the additional subject matter recited therein.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

### **Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the application, withdrawal of the outstanding rejections, allowance of Claims 1-2, 4-6 and 8-10, and the prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowability are respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300, **referencing docket number 108421-00095.**

Respectfully submitted,  
**ARENT FOX PLLC**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Murat Ozgu', is written over the printed name.

Murat Ozgu  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 44,275

Enclosure: Petition for Extension of Time (2 months)

**Customer No. 004372**

1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 400  
Washington, DC 20036-5339  
Telephone: (202) 857-6000

CMM:MO/elp